The following presentation reflects Sasaki's initial analysis of campus conditions and is intended to serve as the basis for planning moving forward. No decisions have been made on any of the ideas in the analysis, and input and comments are welcome from all members of the campus community.

To provide comments, please email Judith Needham at facilities.planner@uky.edu
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Workplan and Schedule

Preliminary Survey Findings

Master Plan Topics

Framework Plan

Next Steps
Key Questions

Is our analysis accurate?

Reactions to the preliminary Framework Plan?

Reactions to the proposed planning principles / “big ideas”?
PRELIMINARY SURVEY FINDINGS
MyCampus Survey

Community Members, 206, 19%
Faculty, 110, 10%
Staff, 312, 28%
Student, 467, 43%

304 Respondents Live On Campus (65% of Student Respondents)
What student life amenities should be expanded?

- Dining halls: 18.5%
- Cafe space: 14.0%
- Residence hall common rooms: 13.2%
- Outdoor recreation: 11.5%
- Indoor recreation (athletics): 9.0%
- Tech support: 6.9%
- Career services: 6.7%
- Meeting rooms <15 people: 6.3%
- Indoor recreation (arcade-style): 5.9%
- Auditorium/theatre space: 4.4%
- Meeting rooms >15 people: 3.4%

The master plan will include planning for student services. Which potential scenario would you prefer?

- Expanded student services in the existing Student Center
- Multiple smaller facilities throughout campus
- No preference
- Two Student Centers (existing student center and a new facility near Central/South Campus dorms)
What neighborhood issues are of concern to you? (check all that apply)

What neighborhood issue is of greatest concern?

- Noise: 87
- Large Parties: 91
- Safety: 105
- Parking: 117
- Decrease in Owner-Occupied Housing: 114
- Adequacy of Public Infrastructure: 74
- Code Violations (Trash, Debris, Property Maintenance): 119

- Adequacy of Public Infrastructure: 57
- Code Violations (Trash, Debris, Property Maintenance): 26
- Decrease in Owner-Occupied Housing: 16
- Large Parties: 11
- Noise: 27
- Parking: 35
- Safety: 35
• Parking is stressful. People are often willing to circle for parking or choose off-campus locations to be close to their destinations
• Both WT Young and areas of the academic core were seen as the heart of the campus
• Many academic spaces need improvements
• Pedestrian safety and traffic issues were frequent concerns
• UK has good fitness amenities
• The arboretum is an asset; other outdoor spaces should be improved
MyCampus Survey
Student Survey Comments

• There is not a single clear campus heart
• WT Young Library and the Johnson Center are well-loved campus life centers for many students
• There is a desire for better connections between K-Lot and destinations on South Campus, especially for safety
• Improvements are needed in many dorms and academic buildings
• Dining and café space are top student life amenities that students want expanded
• North Campus and South Campus have different student life needs
• The academic core lacks informal study and hangout spaces – ones in Whitehall and POT are in high demand
• UK athletics is an important piece of campus life for many students
Several diverse neighborhoods surround UK's campus
Demand for dense student housing is affecting the character of single-family neighborhoods.
Commercial Activity

Lack of commercial near campus activity centers compartmentalizes campus use
Increased density to the north and west of campus is an opportunity to decrease car use.
TAKEAWAYS

- Lack of **clarity around UK’s acquisition boundary** is a concern for residents and businesses along UK’s campus edges.

- **Neighborhood issues vary** according to the percentage and character of student housing.

- Rapid **neighborhood change and destabilization** has been an issue.

- Neighborhoods are concerned about **rising student enrollment** and potential for further change.

- Campus **parking in neighborhoods** is a frequent concern.

- Near-campus **retail is lagging** despite student buying power.

- There may be **opportunities to collaborate with LFUCG** on commercial development and code enforcement issues.

- There may be opportunities to **build commercial corridor development**, in line with U3 Ventures’ recommendations.
CAMPUS HISTORY
UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

**Campus in the Park**
- 1865: UK is established as a land-grant institution. It is called the Agricultural and Mechanical College (AMM) of Kentucky, a publicly chartered department of Kentucky University.
- 1878: AMM is separated from Kentucky University (now Transylvania University).
- 1882: In 1882, the Agricultural & Mechanical College moves to a new 52-acre campus on South Limestone Street. The land was formerly a city park and fairgrounds and was offered to the College by the City Council.
- 1908: AMM College achieves university status, and the name is changed to "State University, Lexington, Kentucky."

**Pastoral Village**
- 1916: The name, "State University, Lexington, Kentucky," is changed by the state legislature to its current name, "University of Kentucky."

**Modernist Campus**
- 1929: Memorial Hall is completed, built in memory of the 2,766 Kentuckians who died in World War I.
- 1964: The UK Board of Trustees implements the 1962 legislation and establishes the Community College System. In 1954, the Kentucky General Assembly recognizes the Community College System, removing all but Lexington Community College from within the University's jurisdiction.

**Research University**
- 1987: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Education names UK a research university of the first class, as faculty members attract record amounts of grants and contracts.

---

Kentucky becomes the fifteenth state to be admitted to the union in 1792.

---

On February 15, 1882, A&M College moves to its new campus composed of three buildings.

- Administration Building (College building) 1882-present
- White Hall (Boys’ dormitory) 1882-1967
- President’s Home 1881-1967

Credit: http://www.uky.edu/EVPFA/Facilities/MasterPlan/history.html
The Olmsted Plan included a romantic landscape plan and a series of formal quadrangles. The plan created the ceremonial front of the Administration Building and established a connection to downtown Lexington.
This plan showed the development of the medical center and the growth on south campus. It provided for an invasive road network within the core of the campus and several surface parking lots.
1965 Campus History
Crane and Gorwic Plan

This high-density development plan separated the vehicular and pedestrian circulation and proposed closing Rose Street. A network of pedestrian plazas and pedestrian paths connected this urban campus.

Credit: http://www.uky.edu/EVPFA/Facilities/MasterPlan/history.html
This plan developed a series of zones that divided the campus by use. It also accommodated the growth for the medical center across Limestone Street and the expansion of the academic core across Rose Street.
The plan is intended to provide a flexible framework for future development. If enacted, the campus plan provides a method for improving the campus environment while accommodating significant growth in population, facilities and productivity for the next 50 years.
TAKEAWAYS

• UK’s campus planning illustrates a long history of landscape as integral to the identity of the university

• A pedestrian-friendly campus has always been a priority in the past master plans
The campus is located within a broader urban open space system. There are opportunities to connect to this system through open space enhancements and trails.
Topography with Campus Buildings

There is much topographical variation across the campus, which impacts building placement, pedestrian circulation and building access.
Hydrology

There are several areas of the campus that are impacted by hydrology. In particular, the areas adjacent to Funkhouser and Alumni Drive are subject to flooding.
Sink holes

Four sinkholes have been identified on campus near the William T Young Library and Cooperstown Dorms. Areas above the sinkholes cannot be developed and will be incorporated into the proposed landscape framework.
A majority of the campus has minimal sloping, however there are areas in the campus core that have dramatic topography, with slopes above 10%, which impacts building placement, access and pedestrian circulation.
Zones

We have defined four campus zones to assist in our analysis. The zones are defined by their density, character and relationship to the campus core.

Total UK Building Coverage = 16%
128 Acres
Campus Building Coverage

The largest zone on campus, South Campus, remains relatively undeveloped.
Impervious Surfaces

Total Impervious Surface Area = 46%
(374 acres)

The overall campus has a very high percentage of impervious surface (30%).
The campus tree coverage is currently lacking in structure, but will be critical in defining the new campus framework while also creating shade for comfortable outdoor spaces.
Existing Landscape Typologies

Formal Spaces and Gathering Spaces are iconic landscapes and are very successful in creating campus character. Other typologies could be enhanced to create a stronger overall campus framework and more successful outdoor spaces.
Memorial Green
Memorial Amphitheater
TAKEAWAYS

• **Topography** contributes to campus character, but also creates challenges.

• Improvements to campus landscapes will advance the sustainability of **stormwater management** and drainage systems.

• The campus **landscape** would benefit from greater **cohesion and overall connectivity**.

• There are opportunities to reinforce existing spaces in order to **enhance campus character and identity**.

• Stakeholders recognize the **potential of the landscape to enhance a social and informal learning environment**.
LAND USE PLAN
Land Use Precincts

Existing land use concentrations reveal general organization of the campus.
Building Use by Type

Current building uses reveal program concentration in some areas and uses that are removed from the core.
TAKEAWAYS

• Future building decisions should be made with an understanding of the *surrounding land use context and adjacencies* so that individual projects improve cohesion of the entire campus.

• A more deliberate *land use strategy* will ensure that current districts have capacity to expand without interfering with overall campus function.
MOBILITY

Pedestrian Circulation
Bicycle Network
Vehicular Circulation
Transit
Parking
Issues and Opportunities
Pedestrian Circulation

10 min walk
20 min walk
30 min walk

- Major Pedestrian
- Major Pedestrian Crossing Road
- Secondary Pedestrian
- Pedestrian Path
Pedestrian-Vehicular Conflicts
Bicycle Network

Data Sources:
Original Map Created by the UK Campus (REV: 20111031)
Clashing grids
Circulation Issues

Goals
• Reduce vehicular traffic on Rose St.
• Pedestrianize campus core
• Improve cross-campus access

Criteria
• Enable access across SE side of campus
• Without inducing regional traffic
• Negotiate around new housing
• Connect to streets that can handle the traffic
Vehicular Circulation: street hierarchy

Proposed

- Campus Arterial
- Campus Collector
- Campus Local
- City Arterial thru campus
- New cross-campus connection
- Parking Structure

Data Sources:
Original Map Created by UK Campus (REV: 20110112)
University Shuttles

Proposed
TAKEAWAYS

- Heavy traffic on city streets creates **pedestrian safety** issues at key locations and limits effectiveness of current shuttle routes.

- **Newtown Pike Extension** will create a new gateway to campus; regional access and new public school will draw traffic to the Upper/Limestone area.

- Pedestrian routes aren't intuitive; **Rose St. is a barrier** between North and South Central.

- Parking distribution leads to competition for convenient spaces near the academic core and to **parking on residential streets**; vehicles penetrating the campus detract from campus quality, and create conflicts with bicycles and pedestrians.

- Parking, University Shuttle and Service Access can be better coordinated.

- Accommodating additional **hospital** traffic is a priority.
ACADEMIC ENVIRONMENT

Key Themes
Space Needs
Identified Program
Academic Department Meetings Held

College of Agriculture
College of Arts and Science
Gatton College of Business and Economics
College of Communications & Information Studies
College of Dentistry
College of Design
College of Education
College of Engineering
College of Fine Arts
College of Health Sciences
College of Law
College of Medicine
College of Nursing
College of Pharmacy
College of Public Health
College of Social Work
The Graduate School
Patterson School of Diplomacy and International Commerce
Martin School of Public Policy and Administration
Key Themes

Most buildings require investment both for capital replacements (HVAC, water protection, upgrades) and to meet programmatic needs.

Learning spaces require technology and equipment upgrades and flexibility to support new pedagogy.

Instructional space supply does not fully align with current pedagogy; growth will generate greater demand for instructional space.

Request for a large (300-500 seat) lecture hall as well as conference and meeting space.

Additional office space will be needed to accommodate anticipated growth.

Current space does not support inter-disciplinary collaboration; there is a need for spaces for students to meet, collaborate and ‘connect’ both within buildings and outdoors.

There is potential to free up space in the campus core by moving some administrative uses off campus.
Facilities Condition

Facilities condition data reinforces stakeholder observations about needed capital investment.

Data Sources:
Original Map Created by UK Campus Physical Plant Division (REV: 20110203)

The Facilities Condition Index primarily reflects the age of the buildings. Tremendous effort and skill is put into the maintenance of all buildings.
Classroom Utilization – Registrar Scheduled

- Classroom utilization data illustrates high current utilization over 36-hour peak scheduling period
- Room occupancy is generally lower than 65% industry guideline; suggests potential for better fit between classroom supply and courses delivered
- Utilization reinforces classroom deficit finding
- Introduction of on-line and ‘short-distance learning’ courses could mitigate some demand on classroom space

Source: Provost Office of Resource Management
Classroom Utilization – Colleges

- Rooms scheduled exclusively by colleges achieve slightly lower utilization
- ‘College Priority’ rooms achieve very high utilization with some potential for higher occupancy
- Data generally reinforces overall classroom space needs and potential for improved fit

Source: Provost Office of Resource Management
Program Needs Identified in Stakeholder Meetings

**Instructional Space**
- Better mix of classrooms with ability to accommodate flexible furniture, break-out spaces, team learning, technology upgrades, ‘smart classrooms’
- Interstitial and outdoor space to support collaboration; ‘Engagement Center’ for off-campus students
- Request for larger classrooms (100 seats) and large lecture hall (500 seats)

**Office Space**

**Lab Space**
- Renovated lab space for Arts and Sciences (Chemistry and Physics and Sloan Building are priorities)
- Flexible lab space that can be shared; simulation labs
- Space for anthropology collection
- Studio and shop space for design programs;
- Music practice rooms and band facility

**Research Space**
- Arts and Sciences research space
- BBSRB II (biological sciences)

**Public and Event Space**
- More public spaces and meeting space to host events
- Conference space with large event space
- Exhibit space, TV studio (Patterson School need)
- Roadhouse Theatre
TAKEAWAYS

- **Quality and condition** of existing buildings and infrastructure is a concern and limits utility of current space.

- There is a need to identify the ideal **mix of classrooms** and other instructional space to meet the University’s mission.

- There is potential to **expand learning opportunities beyond the classroom**.

- There is a need to establish **space needs to accommodate growth** in enrollment and research programs.

- Are there opportunities to move non-academic functions out of the core to free up space for academic programs?
CAMPUS LIFE

Student Life
Student Center
On-Campus Housing
Greek Life
Student Living
Existing Student Center

1938 section: 71,500 gsf
1963 section: 87,500 gsf
1982 section: 61,000 gsf
Total: 220,000 gsf

Perkins + Will

Target expansion: 50,000 gsf
TOTAL: 270,000 gsf
Proposed Student Centers

Student Center North:
Existing GSF: 220,000 gsf

Program
- Student Activities, Leadership, and Involvement
- Study Lounges/Social Lounges/Recreation
- Multi-Purpose Ballroom/Conference/Meeting
- Dining Service 33,727 gsf
- Bookstore 26,220 gsf
- Theater
- Building Services
- Non-Assignable Area 83,232 gsf

Student Center South:
Proposed GSF: ?

Program
- Student Activities, Leadership, and Involvement
- Study Lounges/Social Lounges/Recreation
- Multi-Purpose Ballroom/Conference/Meeting
- *Dining Service --Replace KB Dining 25,000 gsf
- Retail
- Student Center Administration
- Building Services
- Non-Assignable Area
Student Living  Undergraduate Students

Total # of Students Mapped 6,115

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location Range</th>
<th>0-1 Miles</th>
<th>1-2 Miles</th>
<th>2-3 Miles</th>
<th>3-4 Miles</th>
<th>4-5 Miles</th>
<th>&gt; 5 Miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mapped</td>
<td>2,237</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spring 2012  Fayette County

Source:
Admissions obtained from U.S. Spring 2012
Note: Density mapping only includes a subset of student addresses. All other recorded addresses were eliminated due to locations outside of University boundaries or requiring address verification.
TAKEAWAYS

• Need to accommodate **9000 undergraduate beds** on campus and perhaps 500 to 1000 graduate beds near campus

• **Graduate housing** often serves international students; some that have families. Community space and transportation are necessary for this group

• **Off campus graduate and/or upper class housing locations** might contribute to broader community-building goals in alignment with City desires

• There is a **lack of amenities near existing residential areas**, especially in South Campus

• **Lack of student and commercial services in private student housing** areas to the west of campus (South Broadway and Angliana)
GROWTH
INFILL GROWTH
CAMPUS EXPANSION
Acquisition Area and Parcel Inventory

Total Area = 927 Acres
Total Owned = 804 Acres
Acquisition Area = 123 Acres

Data Sources:
GIS Property Boundaries - Lexington-Fayette Urban County Government GIS Office (20120821)
Property Information - Fayette County Property Valuation Administrator’s Office (20120821)
Historic buildings enrich the architectural quality of the campus by reflecting its development over time.
Possible Demolition Sites

Law School and academic expansion
Donovan Hall (Science Hall)
Washington Street
Infill Growth

Housing Infill  =  41.2  acres  (5,600 – 7,000 beds)
Ready Infill    =  40.2  acres
37 year Infill  =  6.2  acres
Future Infill  =  14.7 acres

Total  =  102.3 acres
TAKEAWAYS

• A more detailed **strategy for expansion areas** is needed, together with an understanding of potential partnerships.

• Some buildings with **historic character** have been identified for **demolition** in order to increase campus density.

• Several **capital projects** need to be accommodated.

• Plans for **building demolition** free up space, which should be considered in the context of broader campus organization, open space structure and place-making.
FRAMEWORK PLAN

Current Vision
Existing Framework
Preliminary Framework
Existing Plan  Current Vision

Includes:
1. 2002 Master Plan
2. EdR SCB Housing
3. Greek Park
4. Research and Health Colleges (AECOM)
5. Newtown Pike Extension
6. UK Facilities Transformation

Existing Plan
Develop a planning and design strategy for the transition zones around the campus.
Preliminary Framework  Civic Structure

The open space network should serve as the connective tissue for the campus.
Create mixed use zones on north campus, medical expansion and more student housing on central campus, and a sports and recreation district on south campus.
Proposed Framework  Mobility

Vehicular traffic channeled around the campus core
Proposed Classroom Building
2 Proposed Academic Building
3 Business and Economics Renovation and Addition
4 Law School Renovation and Addition
5 Proposed Science Buildings
6 Proposed Digital Village Buildings

Infill the academic core with academic and research buildings that reinforce the pedestrian spines and build learning communities.
Two student centers could serve each of the housing districts. A potential partnership with downtown recreational facilities could provide needed amenities for the housing in the north district.
Preliminary Framework  Growth

Densify areas within or close to academic core.
PRELIMINARY PRINCIPLES
COMMUNITY
Forge partnerships to strengthen the neighborhoods surrounding the campus and downtown
CIVIC STRUCTURE
Establish a legible civic structure that improves campus quality and reinforces campus identity
MOBILITY
Facilitate safer and more efficient mobility in support of the Master Plan land use and landscape concepts
ACADEMIC ENVIRONMENT
Create a 21st century learning environment that supports the technological, social, economic and creative needs of today's students
CAMPUS LIFE
Enhance the student life experience and reinforce campus community in strong residential districts, both on and off campus
GROWTH
Establish a long-term plan for growth management consistent with the UK mission and that efficiently utilizes land resources